

REMARKS

Claims 60-62, 66-72 and 75 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 60-62, 66-69, 71 and 72 are amended, claim 75 is added, and claims 63-65, 73 and 74 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Support for the amendments the claims 60 and 71 can be found, for example, in Fig. 7. Claims 61, 62, 66-69 and 72 are amended for form. Support for new claim 75 can be found, for example, in Fig. 7. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Heinrich in the April 16, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 60-74 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the alleged Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,531,191 to Notenboom, and further in view of EP 0930641 A2 to Kiguchi et al. (hereinafter Kiguchi) and U.S. Patent No. 5,316,800 to Noakes et al. (hereinafter Noakes). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the April 16, 2008 personal interview, the alleged AAPA, Kiguchi, Notenboom and Noakes, all fail to disclose or suggest disposing a first droplet of a first plurality of droplets over a substrate by a first inkjet head, irradiating the first droplet with a first laser beam by a first semiconductor laser, disposing a second droplet of the first plurality of droplets over the substrate by the first inkjet head, irradiating the second droplet with a second laser beam by the first semiconductor laser, disposing a third droplet of a second plurality of droplets over the substrate by a second inkjet head, and irradiating the third droplet with a third laser beam by a second semiconductor laser, as recited in independent claim 60, and as similarly recited in independent claim 71.

The Office Action alleges that the combination of the alleged AAPA, Kiguchi, Notenboom and Noakes, discloses all of the features of independent claims 1 and 71. In particular, the Office Action alleges that (1) the alleged AAPA discloses that droplet deposition and laser treatment are well known in the art, (2) that Notenboom discloses a laser evaporation means, (3) that Kiguchi discloses first and second inkjet heads for depositing droplets, and (4) that Noakes discloses depositing droplets in an interleaved fashion. Applicants respectfully disagree with these assertions.

For example, none of the applied references teach or suggest a method of manufacturing a wiring substrate including disposing first and second droplets over a substrate by a first inkjet head, irradiating the first and second droplets by a first and second laser beam by a first semiconductor laser which is attached to the first inkjet head, disposing a third droplet over the substrate by a second inkjet head, and irradiating the third droplet by a second semiconductor laser which is attached to the second inkjet head, as recited in independent claim. That is, the combination of the alleged AAPA, Kiguchi, Notenboom and Noakes fails to disclose a method of manufacturing a wiring substrate by irradiating droplets over a substrates via first and second lasers, such that the first and second lasers are attached/integrated with first and second inkjet heads, respectively, and such that the first and second laser are semiconductor lasers, as claimed in independent claim 60, and as similarly claimed in independent claim 71.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 60 and 71 are patentable over the combination of the alleged AAPA, Kiguchi, Notenboom and Noakes. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 61, 62, 66-70 and 72 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of independent claims 60 and 71, from which these claims variously depend, as well as for the additional features these claims recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 65 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the alleged AAPA, in view of Notenboom, Kiguchi and Noakes, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,710,072 to Shrader et al. (hereinafter Shrader). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This rejection is premised upon the presumption that the combination of the alleged AAPA, Notenboom, Kiguchi and Noakes, discloses all of the features of independent claim 1, from which claims 65 depends. As discussed above, the combination of the alleged AAPA, Notenboom, Kiguchi and Noakes, does not disclose all of the features of independent claim 1. Further, Shrader does not remedy the deficiencies of the alleged AAPA, Notenboom, Kiguchi and Noakes. Thus, claim 65 is patentable at least in view of the patentability of claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 75 also is patentable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.
Registration No. 61,310

JAO:LXF/mld

Date: April 22, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461